

m



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/732,541      | 12/07/2000  | Gregory Zoller       | CSCO-68341          | 4178             |

7590

10/21/2004

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP  
Third Floor  
Two North Market Street  
San Jose, CA 95113

|          |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

THAI, HANH B

|          |              |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

2161

DATE MAILED: 10/21/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

09/732,541

**Applicant(s)**

ZOLLER ET AL.

**Examiner**

Hanh B Thai

**Art Unit**

2161

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on RCE filed July 8, 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-8, 10, 12, 13, 15-18 and 26-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-8, 10, 12, 13, 15-18 and 26-41 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Art Unit: 2161

This is in response to the Request continued Examination filed July 8, 2004.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 2-8, 10, 12-13, 15-18 and 26-41 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 2-8, 10, 12-13, 15-18 and 26-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoover et al. (U. S. patent no. 5,560,005) of record in view of Challenger et al. (U. S. Patent no. 6,256,712) of record and further in view of Gerken, III (U. S. patent no. 6,601,072).

Regarding claims 3 and 31, Hoover discloses a method of providing access to information comprising the steps of:

a) a repository receiving a call from an application program, the call specifying a user identifier and a requested set of information of a plurality of sets of information (see Fig. 3, corresponding text, col.16, lines 54-58 and col. 28, line 60 to col. 29, line 4, Hoover). Hoover discloses in Fig.3 that the "Object 1" of the patient object in the patient database or repository receiving a call from application program to request a message or a set of information in

Art Unit: 2161

physician object. The patient and physician who sending the request or receiving the response have to be identified or have to have an user identifier;

b) in response to the call, the repository determining locations having portions of the requested information corresponding to the user identifier (see Fig. 3, col. 24, lines 47-49 and col. 28, line 60 to col. 29, line 4, Hoover);

b1) determining a plurality of fields associated with the requested set of information (see col. 15, lines 4-15 and col. 24, lines 25-33, Hoover); and

b2) accessing a stored mapping of the fields to the databases (see col. 24, lines 9-33, Hoover);

c) using the user identifier and the stored mapping, the central repository retrieving information corresponding to a first of the plurality of fields from a first of the plurality of databases (see col. 24, line 60 to col. 25, line 8 and Fig. 1, Hoover). The information of the “client site 1” corresponds to the first of the plurality of fields from a first of the plurality of databases;

d) using the user identifier the stored mapping, the central repository retrieving information corresponding to a second of the plurality of fields from a second of the plurality of databases (see col. 24, line 60 to col. 25, line 8 and Fig.1, Hoover). The information of the “client site 2” corresponds to the first of the plurality of fields from a first of the plurality of databases; and

e) the repository providing the set of information to the application program, retrieved from the first and second databases without requiring storage on an intermediate database (see col. 11, lines 48-67, Hoover).

Art Unit: 2161

Hoover, however, does not explicitly disclose “storing in a cache the set of information”.

Challenger, on the other hand, discloses a method for maintaining and making consistent updates to caches including the step of storing information in cache (see Abstract and Summary of Challenger). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Hoover to store the requested information in cache because it is for the security reason and system's efficiency.

Hoover and Challenger combination does not disclose “the first and second database store information in a different format from one another.”

Gerken discloses a system and method for distribution of application data to distributed databases of dissimilar formats that the local and remote database store information in a different format from one another (see Abstract, col. 3, lines 15-28, Gerken). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Hoover and Challenger to store data information in plurality databases of different formats because it provides software's efficiency, for example, update parallel (see col. 2, lines 29-34, Gerken).

Regarding claim 2, Hoover/Challenger/Gerken combination further discloses determining the entitlement status corresponding to the user identifier with respect to the set of information (see col. 16, lines 31-35, Hoover).

Regarding claims 4-5, Hoover/Challenger/Gerken combination further discloses the step of updating a first of the plurality of fields in the set of the information by writing information to a first of the plurality of databases (see col. 27, line 62 to col. 28, line 10, Hoover).

Regarding claim 6, Hoover/Challenger/Gerken combination further discloses that the update is based upon monitoring activity of a user of the application program, the activity being

Art Unit: 2161

related to the information (see col.3, lines 14-24, col. 39, lines 54-64 and col. 53, lines 23-37, Hoover).

Regarding claim 7, Hoover/Challenger/Gerken combination further discloses a first database with entitlement information thereon and a second database with user profile information thereon (see col. 14, line 60 to col. 15, line 31, Hoover).

Regarding claim 8, Hoover/Challenger/Gerken combination further discloses the steps of providing a parameter to the application program that is used to track active user records (col. 20, line 1, Hoover) stored in the cache and deleting the user record from the cache if the user record is inactive (see abstract; col. 2, line 66 to col. 3, line 5, Challenger).

Regarding claims 10, 16 and 26, Hoover discloses a computer readable medium having stored thereon program instructions for providing access to information stored on a plurality of databases:

- the program operable to process requests from an application program, the requests identifying a first of the plurality of logical collections of the information and a first of a plurality of users (see col. 11, lines 48-67, Hoover);
- the program further operable to retrieve the information corresponding to the at least the first of the plurality of fields, the information corresponding to the user identified by the request from the application program (see col.12, lines 1-19 and Fig.2-3, Hoover).

Hoover, however, does not explicitly disclose the logical mapping and physical mapping of the plurality of fields of the information to the plurality of databases. But, Hoover, discloses the mapping of the plurality of fields of the information to the plurality of databases (see Abstract and col. 40, lines 24-56, Hoover). At machine level like the system of Hoover have to

Art Unit: 2161

have physical address to locate a physical record (see col. 17, lines 4-14, Hoover), and the record have to have the identification (see col. 41, lines 10-19, Hoover) to specify the record that is logical mapping of the records.

Furthermore, Hoover does not disclose “storing the set of information and removing the set of information ... if it has not been accessed for a pre-determined period of time”.

Challenger, on the other hand, discloses these limitations (see Abstract and Summary of Challenger). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Hoover to remove the information from cache or delete stale information when the pre-determined time has been out because it is for the security reason and system's efficiency.

Hoover and Challenger combination does not disclose “the first and second database store information in a different format from one another.”

Gerken discloses a system and method for distribution of application data to distributed databases of dissimilar formats that the local and remote database store information in a different format from one another (see Abstract, col. 3, lines 15-28, Gerken). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Hoover and Challenger to store data information in plurality databases of different formats because it provides software's efficiency, for example, update parallel (see col. 2, lines 29-34, Gerken).

Regarding claim 12, Hoover/Challenger/Gerken combination further discloses the computer wherein the first database comprises entitlement information (see col. 15, lines 32-62, Hoover).

Regarding claim 13, Hoover/Challenger/Gerken combination further discloses the second database comprises user profile information (see col. 14, line 60 to col. 15, line 31, Hoover).

Art Unit: 2161

Regarding claim 15, Hoover/Challenger/Gerken combination further discloses operable program to update the information for the first of the logical collections of the information by writing to a first of the plurality of databases (see col. 27, line 62 to col. 28, line 10, Hoover).

Regarding claim 17, Hoover/Challenger/Gerken combination further discloses the information relates to a single user (see col. 12, lines 20-31, Hoover).

Regarding claim 18, Hoover/Challenger/Gerken combination further discloses the information pertaining to a group of users (see col. 12, lines 33-52 and Fig.1, Hoover).

Regarding claim 27, Hoover/Challenger/Gerken combination further discloses the updating of the information for the first of the logical collections of the information (see col. 15, lines 33-44, Hoover).

Regarding claims 28-29, Hoover/Challenger/Gerken combinations further discloses that the application programs are compliant with different programming languages from one other (see col. 9, lines 48-65 and col. 11, lines 48-55, Hoover).

Regarding claim 30, Hoover/Challenger/Gerken combination further discloses the process requests originating from more than one programming language (see, Hoover).

Regarding claim 32, Hoover/Challenger/Gerken combination further discloses the entitlement status corresponding to the user identifier with respect to the set of information (see col. 14, line 60 to col. 15, line 31, Hoover).

Regarding claim 33, Hoover/Challenger/Gerken combinations further discloses the updating the plurality of fields in the set of information (see col. 15, lines 33-44, Hoover).



Art Unit: 2161

Regarding claims 34-35, Hoover/Challenger/Gerken combinations further discloses the requesting the set of information comprises information relating to a single user and a group of users (see col. 9, lines 8-47, Hoover).

Regarding claims 36-37, Hoover/Challenger/Gerken combinations further discloses the providing a parameter to the application program that is used to track active user records (see col. 28, line 30 to col.29, line 10, col.54, lines 15-17, Fig.11 and corresponding text, Hoover).

Regarding claim 38, Hoover/Challenger/Gerken combinations further discloses the program uses a first application program interface that allows reading and updating records on the plurality of databases and a second application program interface that allows creation of records on the plurality of databases, wherein the first application program interface is usable via an objection request broker and the second application program interface is not available via the objection request broker (see Fig. 14 and corresponding text, Hoover). Please note Fig.14; col. 34, 35 and 36 of Hoover show 1<sup>st</sup> API that allows reading and updating records at RDB1 via object broker 20. Hoover, however, does not require the ORB for creation records. In other word, 2<sup>nd</sup> API not available via ORB is met the claim limitation.

Regarding claim 39, Hoover/Challenger/Gerken combinations further discloses the central repository performing concurrency management of information stored on the plurality of databases (see col.24, lines 31-42, Challenger).

Regarding claim 40, Hoover/Challenger/Gerken combinations further discloses the central repository associating a version number with a user record; the central repository updating the version number if the user record is updated; the central repository providing the current version number of the user record to applications requesting the user record; and the

Art Unit: 2161

central repository allowing a write involving the user record only if a version number of the user record that is provided by an application attempting the write matches the version number currently associated with the user record (see col. 16, lines 59-65, Fig.16 and corresponding text, Challenger).

Regarding claim 41, Hoover/Challenger/Gerken combinations further discloses the stored mapping of the fields to the databases maps fields associated with the requested set of information to databases, and wherein the first field is mapped to the first database and the second field is mapped to the second database in the stored mapping (see col. 22, lines 47-61; col. 24, line 9 to col. 25, line 8, Hoover).

### ***Conclusion***

2. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hanh B Thai whose telephone number is 703-305-4883 and 571-272-4029 after October 21, 2004. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM - 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 703-308-1436. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Art Unit: 2161

Hanh Thai ~~HT~~  
Art Unit 2161  
September 30, 2004



**UYEN LE**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**